IN THE HIGH COURT OF UTTARANCHAL AT NAINITAL

Writ Petition (MB) No. 411 of 2006

1. Amabrish Sharma s/o Sri Sewa Ram
R/o 441. Geetanjali Vihar, Ganeshpur, Roorkee,
P.S. Gangnahar, Roorkee, District Haridwar

2. Mayank Gupta s/o Shri Som Prakash Gupta,
R/o 244/1, Yoganand Vihar, Purva Deen Dayal,
Roorkee, P.S. Gangnahar Roorkee, District Haridwar.

3. Brajesh Gupta s/o Sri Gyan Chand Gupta,
R/o 205, Maqtool Puri, Roorkee,
P.S. Gangnahar Roorkee, District Haridwar.

4. Umesh Kohli s/o Shri G.B.Kohli,
R/o 256, Lane No. 10, Ramnagar,
Roorkee, P.S. – Gangnahar Roorkee,
District Haridwar.

5. Anil Sharma s/o Shri Shiv Kumar Sharma,
R/o 77/16, Purva Vali, Railway Road,
Ganeshpur, Roorkee, P.S. Gangnahar Roorkee,
District Haridwar.

6. Dinesh Dayal s/o Shri Bashweshwar Dayal,
R/o 751, West Amber Talab, Roorkee,
P.S. Gangnahar Roorkee, District Haridwar

7. Pradumna Rana s/o Shri Janak Singh,
R/o 6 Maqtool Puri, Roorkee,
P.S. Gangnahar Roorkee, District Haridwar

8. Rajesh Singhal s/o Shri Prakash Chand Singhal,
R/o 117, Avas Vikas Roorkee, P.S. Gangnahar Roorkee,
District Haridwar …… Petitioners

Versus

1. State of Uttaranchal through S.S.P. Haridwar,
District Haridwar

2. S.H.O., P.S. Kotwali Roorkee,
District Haridwar

3. Shri S.C. Tyagi, UP-Khand Adhikari,
Vidhyut Vitran Upkhand-I, Roorkee,
P.S. Kotwali, Roorkee,
District Haridwar …….. Respondents

……..

Petitioners' counsel absent.
Sri H.C. Pande, A.G.A. for the respondents.

JUDGMENT

Coram: Hon'ble Rajeev Gupta, C. J.
Hon'ble P.C. Pant, J.

RAJEEV GUPTA, C. J. (Oral)

Petitioners' counsel absent.

Sri H. C. Pande, Additional Government Advocate for the respondents.

2. Sri Pande, the learned Additional Government Advocate submits that the writ petition filed by petitioners seeking quashing of the First Information Report and the case registered against them has now become infructuous as the police after the completion of the investigation has filed charge-sheet against the petitioners before the concerning Court.

3. In this view of the matter, the writ petition is dismissed as infructuous.

4. With the above order, CLMA No. 4275 of 2006 also stands dismissed as infructuous.

(P.C. Pant, J.) 08.08.2006

(Rajeev Gupta, C. J.) 08.08.2006

A